Pine View Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Pine View Elementary School

5333 PARKWAY BLVD, Land O Lakes, FL 34639

https://pves.pasco.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Jaworski

Start Date for this Principal: 7/22/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: C (50%) 2014-15: A (72%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org.](http://www.floridacims.org)

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Pine View Elementary School

5333 PARKWAY BLVD, Land O Lakes, FL 34639

https://pves.pasco.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	50%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	38%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	C	A	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The PVES community will develop the knowledge and skills to become caring, lifelong learners through inquisitive, collaborative and reflective practices by respecting diversity and becoming globally minded citizens who are empowered to take action.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Collaborate and communicate to learn within and outside of the school community.
Take ownership for learning and reflect on progress.
Think critically to understand and solve the real world problems.
Utilize a variety of tools and resources to enhance learning.
Build strong content knowledge and apply learning to new contexts.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Moore, Kathryn	Principal	Principal will lead all instruction, manage operations, and collaborate with stakeholders to ensure the success of all students.
Reynolds, Mary	Assistant Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	84	72	96	96	104	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	546
Attendance below 90 percent	13	9	7	6	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	24	18	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	5	3	1	5	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
44

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 7/22/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	62%	58%	57%	73%	56%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	56%	58%	64%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	54%	53%	49%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	65%	60%	63%	73%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	61%	62%	71%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	50%	51%	55%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	51%	53%	53%	62%	49%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	84 (0)	72 (0)	96 (0)	96 (0)	104 (0)	94 (0)	546 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	13 ()	9 ()	7 ()	6 ()	9 ()	11 ()	55 (0)
One or more suspensions	1 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	2 ()	3 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 ()	1 ()	3 ()	0 ()	1 ()	5 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	24 ()	18 ()	24 ()	66 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

				ELA			
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	67%	60%	7%	58%	9%
	2018	68%	57%	11%	57%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	59%	8%	58%	9%
	2018	67%	55%	12%	56%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	60%	55%	5%	56%	4%
	2018	65%	56%	9%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	65%	59%	6%	62%	3%
	2018	61%	59%	2%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	62%	7%	64%	5%
	2018	70%	59%	11%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	65%	57%	8%	60%	5%
	2018	67%	58%	9%	61%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	53%	53%	0%	53%	0%
	2018	67%	56%	11%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	20	33	39	26	50	40	9				
ELL	27			55							
BLK	48	56		52	67						
HSP	48	46	46	56	66	47	28				
WHT	69	57	57	71	69	43	67				
FRL	46	47	50	50	61	45	36				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	32	34	5	28	38	24	44				
BLK	56			63							
HSP	55	46	32	53	49	21	50				
WHT	72	51	13	73	67	30	74				
FRL	58	51	28	57	61	28	50				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	33	44	43	29	53	46	11				
ELL	55			82							
BLK	91			82							
HSP	62	64	50	69	77	67	58				
MUL	60			60							
WHT	76	64	47	74	69	50	63				
FRL	67	64	52	69	77	67	47				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	77
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	480
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	56
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The lowest performance was students in the lowest quartile math achievement (48%) and Science Achievement (51%). Although our lowest area was math lowest quartile they made significant gains from previous year +22%). Science decrease by 15% this may have been related to lack of focus on the master of science standards.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Our greatest decline was Science Achievement with a decline of 15%. The lack of focus on science standards may have contributed to the decline.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Our greatest achievement gap was in Science by 2 percentage points,

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Lowest quartile ELA students made the most gains, gains were 32 percentage points. We attribute this to the focus on ELA interventions. We used ACT Now a research based intervention program.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Student achievement level on FSA was our greatest concern especially in the area of 5th grade science.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. 5th grade Science Achievement (SWD)
2. Lowest Quartile Math (SWD)
3. Math Achievement Data had 2 point decline
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Instructional Fidelity of SWD
Rationale	To ensure instructional integrity for SWD in the area of ELA, Math and Science.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Decrease the percent of students scoring below a level 1 & 2 as measured by FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kathryn Moore (kjmoore@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Continue to use ACT NOW for ELA intervention comprehension strategies. Refine 5th grade interventions to focus on division strategies. Fact Fluency Strategies
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	ACT Now is a research based intervention strategy that proved successful the prior year. Division is a core standard in Math instruction for 5th grade that determines success on assessments Fact Fluency impacts efficiency in problem solving

Action Step	
Description	1. Create a progress monitoring system for students with disabilities. 2. Conduct biweekly review of SWD performance data. 3. Conduct walkthroughs of interventions of SWD and provide direct feedback 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Kathryn Moore (kjmoore@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

We will create a progress monitoring system that will be timely and give direct feedback on instructional practices.